• • •	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/147,919	CARDOSA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	1648
All Participants:	Status of Application	on:
(1) Mary E. Mosher, Ph.D.	(3)	
(2) <u>Antoinette Konski I)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 1 & 12 July 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	E GENERAL NATURE OF WHA	T WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a set did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ition. The examiner will provide eparate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representa	ative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Is there a claim to benefit of DK 1035/96? Inventor's oath says priority not claimed, but MM can't figure out if a claim is made somewhere else in the file, the file has been imaged & it is difficult to find thiings. Yes, claim was made & acknowledged in earlier Office action. However, on reviewing file records, AK noted that this application was filed without figures, and authorized Exr's amendment to delete the figures and all references to them. Neither AK nor MM understand where the figures in the image file originated, possibly from a priority document.